UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No.	04-6457	

RICHARD JANSEN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

RONALD HUTCHINSON, Warden; JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN, JR., Attorney,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (CA-04-137-1-CCB)

Submitted: July 15, 2004 Decided: July 21, 2004

Before MOTZ, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Richard Jansen, Appellant Pro Se. John Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Ann Norman Bosse, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Richard Jansen seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition as untimely. Jansen cannot appeal this order unless a circuit judge or justice issues a certificate of appealability, and a certificate of appealability will not issue absent a "substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A habeas appellant meets this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. <u>Cockrell</u>, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); <u>Slack v. McDaniel</u>, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Jansen has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED